

**IN THE UNITED STATES DISTRICT COURT  
SOUTHERN DISTRICT OF OHIO  
EASTERN DIVISION**

<b>TERESA WHITE</b>	:	<b>CASE NO.</b>
	:	
<b>Plaintiff,</b>	:	<b>JUDGE</b>
	:	
<b>vs.</b>	:	
	:	
<b>ROTO-ROOTER SERVICE COMPANY</b>	:	
	:	
<b>Defendant.</b>	:	

**NOTICE OF REMOVAL**

Defendant Roto-Rooter Services Company, (hereinafter referred to as “Defendant Roto-Rooter”), hereby files this Notice of Removal, pursuant to 28 U.S.C. § 1441, with the United States District Court for the Southern District of Ohio, Eastern Division. As grounds for removal, Defendant Roto-Rooter states as follows:

1. This case was commenced and is now pending in the Common Pleas Court of Franklin County, designated as case number 25 CV 003723 on the docket. A copy of Plaintiff’s Complaint is attached as Exhibit A.
2. Defendant Roto-Rooter’s Answer and Counterclaim is attached as Exhibit B.
3. At the time of Plaintiff’s commencement of this action, Plaintiff was citizens of the State of Ohio.
4. Defendant Roto-Rooter is a foreign corporation organized and existing under the laws of the State of Iowa. It was, at the time of commencement of this action, and still is, a non-citizen, having its principal place of business in the state of Iowa.
5. Thus, as between Plaintiff and Defendant, the controversy is wholly between citizens of different states.

6. The United States District Court, pursuant to the provisions of 28 U.S.C. § 1332, has jurisdiction over this action because there is complete diversity, and, upon information and belief, the matter in controversy exceeds the sum of \$75,000, exclusive of interest and costs.

7. Plaintiff alleges in her Complaint that Defendant Roto-Rooter “used high pressure sales tactics when providing the estimate to Plaintiff” and Defendant Roto-Rooter “did not perform all of the work that it represented it would complete.” Plaintiff further alleges that Defendant Roto-Rooter caused damage to Plaintiff’s dwelling by failing to limit “dust or particles.”

8. Plaintiff alleges violations of the Consumer Sales Practices Act and the Home Solicitation Sales Practices Act. Plaintiff has demanded attorney fees and treble damages against Defendant Roto-Rooter. *See* Exhibit A.

9. Defendant reached out to Plaintiff to clarify the damages sought or to be claimed by Plaintiff. Plaintiff confirmed that the amount in controversy exceeds \$75,000.00 as she would not stipulate to cap her damages at \$75,000. Correspondence attached as Exhibit C.

10. This Notice is filed pursuant to 28 U.S.C. § 1441 within the time limits prescribed by 28 U.S.C. § 1446(b)(3).

11. Defendant will give written notice of the filing of this notice as required by 28 U.S.C. § 1446(d).

WHEREFORE, Defendant Roto-Rooter Services Company, provides notice that this action is removed to the United States District Court for the Southern District of Ohio, Eastern Division pursuant to 28 U.S.C. §§ 1441 and 1446, and that the Common Pleas Court of Franklin County, Ohio, shall proceed no further unless this case is remanded.

Respectfully submitted,

/s/ Austin Richards

Austin Richards (0101316)

**REMINER CO., L.P.A.**

200 Civic Center Drive, Suite 800

Columbus, Ohio 43215

Tel: 614-228-1311 | Fax: 614-232-2410

[arichards@reminger.com](mailto:arichards@reminger.com)

*Counsel for Defendant, Roto-Rooter Services  
Company*

**CERTIFICATE OF SERVICE**

I hereby certify that a true and accurate copy of the foregoing document was filed and served by operation of this Court's CM/ECF electronic filing system and by email this 26<sup>th</sup> day of June, 2025 upon the following:

/s/ Austin Richards

Austin Richards (0101316)